



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

The 'Annals of Murād II'

Author(s): V. L. Ménage

Source: *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London*, Vol. 39, No. 3 (1976), pp. 570-584

Published by: Cambridge University Press on behalf of School of Oriental and African Studies

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/614715>

Accessed: 18/10/2008 07:36

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/action/showPublisher?publisherCode=cup>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is a not-for-profit organization founded in 1995 to build trusted digital archives for scholarship. We work with the scholarly community to preserve their work and the materials they rely upon, and to build a common research platform that promotes the discovery and use of these resources. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



School of Oriental and African Studies and Cambridge University Press are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London.

<http://www.jstor.org>

THE ' ANNALS OF MURĀD II '

By V. L. MÉNAGE

It is now some years since Professor Halil İnalçık expressed the hope¹ that a 'systematic investigation in the library collections of Turkey' might bring to light, in their original independent form, the fifteenth-century Ottoman 'calendars' (*takvîm*) or 'chronological lists' whose existence is to be postulated from the analysis of the style and content of the chronicle-texts² into which they have evidently been incorporated.³ The subject of these lists was then much in my mind, so that while I was in Turkey in 1958-9 I was on the look-out for such a text. My search, if not 'systematic', was fairly thorough; all the same, it was fruitless: I came upon several late examples, to indicate that the chronological list remained a favourite form of compilation beyond the fifteenth century, but no early self-contained text, relating the events of two or three decades, of the type whose existence the chronicles indicated. The kindness of a colleague, however, has now led me in London to what I believe to be the copy of such a text.

Mr. Simon Digby recently showed me an Ottoman manuscript which he acquired after the Phillipps sale of 25 November 1968.⁴ The principal work in it (fols. 1v-121r), written in a very clear *naskh* (? sixteenth century), fully vocalized, is an anonymous Ottoman chronicle relating the history of the dynasty from its legendary beginnings down to Bâyezid II's Moldavian campaign (misdated 886, for 889/1484).⁵ Inserted in it (fols. 75r-95r) is the

¹ In a paper entitled 'The rise of Ottoman historiography' presented to a conference held at the School of Oriental and African Studies in 1958 and thereafter printed in B. Lewis and P. M. Holt (ed.), *Historians of the Middle East*, London, 1962, at p. 159.

² Namely, the 'Anonymous Chronicles' edited by F. Giese (*Die altosmanischen anonymen Chroniken*, I, Breslau, 1922, and II (translation) in *Abh. für die Kunde des Morgenlandes*, XVII, 1, 1925, 1-170) and the chronicle of Uruk (Oruç) b. 'Âdil (ed. F. Babinger from the MSS of Oxford and Cambridge, Hanover, 1925; another MS at Manisa, two more at Paris), whom Dr. Beldiceanu-Steinherr has now proved to have been living in Edirne in the middle years of the reign of Bâyezid II (*BSOAS*, XXXIII, 2, 1970, 359-63).

³ See, e.g., Lewis and Holt (ed.), *Historians of the Middle East*, 157-9 (İnalçık) and 170-2 (Ménage). The lists incorporated into these chronicles are similar in style but quite different in content from the 'royal' lists, compiled in the Palace, which have survived in independent form (for them, see V. L. Ménage, *Nehshîrî's history of the Ottomans*, London, 1964, 15).

⁴ It was Lot 237 in Sotheby's sale-catalogue of that date (*Bibliotheca Phillipica, New Series: medieval manuscripts*, pt. IV), having been MS 871 in the collection of the eccentric bibliophile Sir Thomas Phillipps (1792-1872). It had earlier been in the possession of Auguste Chardin, being Lot 2628 in the Chardin sale of 9 February 1824 in Paris. It now bears the number 160 in Mr. Digby's private collection. I am most grateful to the present owner for allowing me to describe the contents and to publish a section of the text.

⁵ The text begins, after the *besmele*, etc.: *Ammâ ba'd: bu risâlenûn tâliblerine ve nâzîrlarına i'lâm olunan budur-ki bir cemâ'at iâvâni-sâdîk ve hâllâni-yârâni-muvâfîk bu aâz-âfi 'l-'ibâd-i bîçâreye iâkdâm gösterüb eyitdiler: Her fuşâhâ ve bulağadan işbu 'âlem-i fânîde def-i melâl ve kat-i sâ'âl içün bir yâdîgâr komîşlardur; eyle olsa ... and ends: ... döñüb girü İstanbul'a geldi. Va'llâhu a'lem. Râvî eydür: ol zamânda târih seksen altısındaydı. Bundan soñra Sultân Bâyezid Hân Edrenede bir 'âli 'imâret ve bir medrese ve bir timârhanâ ve bir hammâm ve bir köprü yapıldı*

'Legendary history of Constantinople'. There is a colophon: the copyist, Mahmūd b. 'Abdullāh, completed his work 'at noon on a Saturday in Cumādā I' (no year), in a certain 'village' which I cannot identify.⁶ A European hand has added 'dans la petite tartarie'. On the flyleaf the same hand⁷ has written 'Histoire de la famille Othomane'; beneath this appears, in an earlier hand, 'Taouarikh al Othman. Historia gentis Othomannicae ab ipso Othomanno ad annum Hegirae 855. Turcicè'.

This main work is an abridged, popularized, and much mutilated text of 'Āşıkpaşazāde, and is therefore similar in character (though not in textual detail) to the Paris MS Ancien fonds 118.⁸ It lacks 'Āşıkpaşazāde's autobiographical references, his verses, and his characteristic chapter-headings; but that it derives from 'Āpz. (and is not a putative source of his) is evident from its presenting material in the order which 'Āpz. may be presumed to have imposed on his sources.⁹ The abridgement is very drastic, particularly towards the end. Nevertheless the text is padded out with conventional, indeed incantatory, descriptions of battles,¹⁰ and the redactor has also added a few details not found in 'Āpz.: the story that Bāyezid I killed himself with poison concealed in a ring,¹¹ and a further echo of the popular conviction that Murād II's son 'Alā'eddīn did not die a natural death.¹²

Clear and careful as the hand of this work is, and in spite of its lavish vocalization, it offers a very poor text; and the same, regrettably, is true for

[ve] müsāfir ve gurebā ve fuķarā ve talebe rāḥat olmajiçün. Va'llāhu a'lem. There is an interesting bibliographical peculiarity at fol. 1r. This page is filled with text, in the same hand as the rest of the MS, but this text is not (as Sotheby's cataloguer believed) 'the end of the previous chapter' of the work beginning on lv; it reproduces the text found on fol. 17r, beginning at exactly the same point. The only explanation is that the copyist was working with unbound 16-page gatherings before him: leaving 1r blank, he filled his first gathering (1v-8v), and then his second (9r-16v); but then, instead of taking up an entirely blank gathering, he picked up the first in error and continued copying onto fol. 1r, not noticing his mistake until he had filled the page, whereupon he re-copied the continuation from 16v onto the present 17r.

⁶ *fi karyat 'lsbk*, with an incomprehensible vocalization; possibly (al-)Esbek or (mis-spelt) İlyās-beg. A copyist of this name (which is, however, of course common) completed a MS of Aḥmedī's *Tarwīḥ al-arwāḥ* ('harekeli nesih') in 932/1526 'at Bozdağ' (F. E. Karatay, *Topkapı Sarayı Müzesi kütüphanesi: Türkçe yazmalar kataloğu*, 1, Istanbul, 1961, no. 1768).

⁷ Chardin's?

⁸ Fully described by P. Wittek, in *MOG*, II, 1-2, 1925, 151-64, and evaluated by F. Giese, *Die altosmanische Chronik des 'Āşıkpaşazāde*, Leipzig, 1929, Einleitung, pp. 8-12.

⁹ One probative passage is 'Āpz., § 67, the first section of which (ed. Giese, 66.22-67.7) is a patent—and clumsy—interpolation into the text of the Anon. (ed. Giese, 34.23). The Digby MS (fol. 50v) has the same presentation.

¹⁰ The following (fol. 13r = 'Āpz., § 17) is typical: *bir ceng-i 'azīm etdiler ki kāfirlere dünŷāyi tenk etdiler, söyle kim küstelerden püşteler oldu, adam kani seyl oluban yürüdü, hün bihāri havā yüzün bürüdü; boz at, kara at yek-renk oldu; ak sakal, kara sakal hem-renk oldu; şirâne ve delirâne bir ceng etdiler kim feleklerde melekler taksin etdiler. Āhîr . . .*

¹¹ fol. 57r. Cf. Oruç (ed. Babinger, 37.8-10, 105.12-14) and MS A of Neşri (ed. Unat-Köyメン, I, p. 362).

¹² fol. 69v: *Rāvî eydür: bu cānibde meger Sultân Murâduñ bir oğlu var-idi, adına Sultân 'Alâ-dîn dîrlerdi, Amâsiyye tahtında otururdu; ol Sultân 'Alâ-dîne ağu vêrûb helâk etdiler. Cf. H. İnalçık, *Fatih devri üzerinde tatkikler ve vesikalar*, 1, Ankara, 1954, 60.*

the short but more interesting work (fols. 121v-125v) which the same copyist has transcribed.

This second text begins with a series of sentences giving the dates of birth, the lengths of reign, and the ages at death of the Ottoman rulers from 'Osman to Mehemed II inclusive, and the next three lines present, in schematic form, the dates for the fall of six cities. Then, after the heading *Tārih* in red ink, follows a continuous text listing the events of the reign of Murād II, from his accession to the marriage of Prince Mehemed to the Zū'l-kadr princess. This continuous text was, however, evidently intended by its compiler to be read as a series of 29 independent paragraphs, all but the first introduced by the word (written in red in the Digby MS) *Def'a* 'And again :', 'Item :'. Each of these paragraphs should have ended with a (Hijrī) date; but only occasionally has the copyist written in, either before or over the *def'a*, the word *sene*, and still more rarely has he written in, over or under the *sene*, in red or in black, the date—and all but one (829) of these dates are patently wrong. However, with the help of the closely related chronicle texts it is a simple matter to supply the dates which are lacking, and so to arrive at a consistent and consecutive series of 'annals'.

In editing the text I have divided it into paragraphs, heading each annal with the date (in square brackets) which the Annalist may be presumed to have intended but leaving uncorrected the few dates in his text. I have indicated in angle brackets the points where a few letters or words have demonstrably been lost in transmission (but have refrained from speculating whether, and if so where, a whole 'item' may have been jumped). Obvious errors of spelling and vocalization, however startling, have been tacitly corrected.¹³ Page and line references to the parallel passages in the chronicle-texts are given in the concordance at the foot of this page.¹⁴ Details not found

Year	Giese	E	O	C	M	P
826	59.17-18, 60.18-19, 64.15-18	32v.4-9	47.17-23	113.16-23	42v.13-43r.7	38r.7-18
827-9	64.18-22	32v.9-33r.2	47.23-48.21	113.23-114.6	43r.7-43v.1	38r.18-39r.14
830	65.16-17	33r.2-3	48.21-24	114.6-8	43v.1-5	39r.14-17
831-5	65.17-25	33r.3-13	48.24-49.23	114.8-25	43v.5-lacuna	39r.17-40r.9
836-40	65.25-66.10	33r.13-34r.1	49.23-51.4	114.25-115.24	lacuna-44v.4	40r.9-41r.14
841-5	66.10-23	34r.1-13	51.4-52.24	115.24-117.5	44v.4-lacuna- 45r.5	41r.15-42v.15
846	66.23-27	34v.1-6	52.25-53.14	117.5-10	45r.5-45v.2	42v.15-43r.14
847	66.27-67.3 (to)	34v.6-11	53.14-24	117.11-18	45v.3-15	43r.15-43v.8
849-51	70.8-22	37v.3-38r.12	58.21-59.21	120.25-121.17	50v.4-lacuna	47v.17-48v.16
852	70.23-26 (to)	38r.12-38v.4	59.21-24	121.17-20	lacuna	48v.16-49r.3
final items	73.7-18	40v.8-41r.5	64.4-12	123.1-7	lacuna	52r.5-13

¹³ e.g. *cenk* for *Canik*, *argur* for *Uzgur*.

¹⁴ I use the following abbreviations: Giese = F. Giese, *Die altosmanischen anonymen Chroniken: Teil 1*, Breslau, 1922; (using Giese's sigla) W₁, W₂, M₂ = (respectively) the expanded

in the chronicles or recorded elsewhere in the chronicles are romanized, but I have commented only occasionally on divergences among the chronicles. The text being so corrupt, the annotation does not pretend to be thorough. A full analysis of the data would open the way to a discussion of much of the chronology of Murād II's reign; but it would be rash to set out far upon that road from so unreliable a starting-point.

Āl-i 'Osmān. <‘Osmān> ibn-ii Ertoñrul vücüda geldi, hicretiñ sene 6<??> tārīh; 'Osmān Ğāzī hurūc etdi, adrna hütbe okundi, hicretiñ sene 687; 'Osmān beglik etdi sene 26, ve 'omri sene 69. Oğlu Orhān Ğāzī vücüda geldi, sene 687; Orhān beglik etdi sene 40, ve 'omri sene 82. Murād Ğāzī ibn-ii Orhān vücüda geldi, <sene ...; beglik etdi> sene 31, 'omri sene 68. Oğlu Yıldırım Bāyezīd vücüda geldi, sene 744; beglik etdi sene 16, ve 'omri sene 60. Oğlu Sultān Muhammed vücüda geldi, hicretiñ <sene ...; beglik etdi> sene 8, ve 'omri sene 65. Sultān Murād ibn-ii Sultān Muhammed Hān vücüda geldi, sene 807; beglik etdi sene 31 māh 3, ve 'omri sene 48. Oğlu Sultān Muhammed Dimetokada vücüda geldi, sene 834; beglik etdi sene 33 māh 2, ve 'omri sene 52. Oğlu Sultān Bāyezīd Amāsiyyede vücüda geldi, sene 851.¹⁵

feth-i	feth-i	feth-i	feth-i	feth-i
Brusa	Gelibolu	Edrene	Dimetoka	Ibsala
Orhān	Süleymān Paşa	Murād Ğāzī		Koşanlıñ
sene	sene	sene	sene	sene
726	788 ¹⁶	761	765 ¹⁷	763
				857

Tārīh:

[824/6.1.1421–25.12.1421]

Sultān Murād ibn-ii Sultān Muhammed Hān tahta cüluş kıldı, hicretiñ sene 824. Kardaşları ile cenk etdi.¹⁸ Vezirleri 'İvāz Paşa, İbrāhīm Paşa.

[825/26.12.1421–14.12.1422]

Def'a: Sultān Murād kardaşları ile girii bu yıl cenk etdi. Karındaş Düzme Muştafā dérler am katl etdi, geldi, Edrenede karār etdi.

version of the 'anonymous chronicle'; the unexpanded but extended version; the Munich MS frequently cited in the apparatus, which is in fact, up to Giese 66.11, a W₃ text and thereafter an 'Oruç'. E = the Edirne MS of the 'anonymous', substantially a W₃ text but with some distinctive (and apparently archaic) features. O, C, M, P = the Oruç texts, (respectively) the MSS of Oxford and Cambridge, published by Babinger, the Manisa MS, and Paris, MS supp. ture 1047. My conclusions concerning the interrelation of these texts are set out in *BSOAS*, xxx, 2, 1967, 314–22.

¹⁵ The text being unreliable, it is profitless to scrutinize these figures. It is perhaps worth noting that they correspond broadly with those given by 'Aşıkpaşa zade (§ 170; Atsuz, p. 248), who calls his source for them *aşıl tevārīh* (or *aşıl-i tevārīh*?)—possibly a list similar to this. Similar figures appear dispersed through the text of Oruç, and not only in the late recension which avowedly contains interpolations from 'Apz.: see S. Buluç, *Untersuchungen*, Breslau, 1938, esp. p. 49.

¹⁶ Read, with Giese, 17.5, 758.

¹⁷ Read, with Oruç (O 20.20), 760.

¹⁸ MS: *kardaşları ile girii bu yıl cenk etdi karındaş*, with *girii bu yıl* and *karındaş* deleted (the copyist having slipped into transcribing the next year's entry).

[826/15.12.1422–4.12.1423]

Def'a: *Sultān Murād* bir karındaşı daňı çıktı *Muştafā* dērler; varub, *Anaoluda* *Iznikde*¹⁹ cenc edüb, soňra կatl edüb, andan gelüb, *İflāk*-ēline geçüb, *İflāk* begi *Durkulayla* cenc edüb, soňra barışub, gelüb gitdi. Veziri 'İvāz Paşadan bir hile duyub, gözlerin çıkarub, yerine Saruca Paşa vezir oldu.²⁰

[827/5.12.1423–22.11.1424]

Def'a: *Sultān Murād* girü *Anaoluya* geçdi. *İzmīr*-oğu *Cüneyd* Beg-ile cenc edüb, soňra dutub, կaydin görüb,²¹ andan varub *Menteşe*-ēlini ve *Aydın* ve *Saruhan*-ēlin ve *Hamīd*-ēlin feth etdi. İbrāhīm Paşa veled-i Hayreddīn Paşa, Saruca Paşa.

[828/23.11.1424–12.11.1425]

Def'a: *Sultān Murād* sefer etmeyüb, *Edrenede* dügün eyleyüb *İsfendiyār* kızını aldi.²² Vezirleri girü İbrāhīm Paşa, Saruca Paşayıdı.

[829/13.11.1425–1.11.1426]

Def'a: *Sultān Murād* *Laz*-ēline vardi. *Laz*-oğu *Koca Desbut* <i> elinden çıkarub vilāyetini feth etdi. Vezirleri mezkür. Sene 829.

[830/2.11.1426–21.10.1427]

Def'a: *Sultān Murād* sefer etmeyüb *Sakar*²³ yaylaya çıktı. İshāk Bege, <Tur>hān Bege çevre ellere²⁴ akin vērdi, her tarafa yürüdiler. Vezirleri mezkür. Sene —.

[831/22.10.1427–10.10.1428]

Def'a: *Sultān* girü *Laz*-ēline vardi, *Gügerçinligi*²⁵ feth etdi. Ve girü bu tarafdan

¹⁹ MS: 'rnkmwdn, vocalized ?Erenkmüdün, presumably to be emended to *Iznikde* (as EOCM), but cf. P: Er.nkūmūr yörenesinde bulușub uğraşdilar.

²⁰ The blinding of 'İvāz Paşa is mentioned in OP, *sub anno* 828, in what appears to be an interpolation (see below). That Saruca became vizier as early as 826/1423 is a new detail, certainly textually (if not historically) correct, cf. next annal: hitherto the earliest reference to Saruca as 'vizier' has been for 1428 (Ducas, 205; cf. P. Wittek, *Byzantion*, xxi, 1951, 328).

²¹ For 'seized and attended to [i.e. killed]' Cüneyd, the chronicles have 'expelled', recording his death and the taking of Ayasoluk (O, but MP: İpsala) *sub anno* 829.

²² ECM have substantially the same text (CM adding çevre ellere akin vērdi); OP, however, have a long entry recording the campaign against İsfendiyār (spring 1423 = 826) followed by the marriage (different wording), the siege of Constantinople (summer 1422 = 825!), the Küçük Muştafā affair (repetition!) and the blinding of 'İvāz Paşa' (P: *Izniki feth edüb ol seferden gelüb veziri Hacı 'İvāz Paşadan bir hile duyub Gelibolida dutub gözlerini çıkardı*), the death (P: *vefat edüb*, O is corrupt) of 'Laz-oğu' (Stephen Lazarević, d. 19.7.1427 = 830), and the Hungarian attack on Gügerçinlik/Golubac (spring 1428 = 831). It seems that items from another (undated?) *takvim* have been interpolated here (cf. O 48.5 and P 38v.9: *ba'zular eydürler/derler*). To make the textual problem still more complex, the W₃ texts lack the 'marriage' item altogether.

²³ MS: *Sefer* (as CP), but to be corrected to *Sakar* (with EOM): the Sakar hills lie some 50 km. north-west of Edirne.

²⁴ The chronicles have *Laz*-ēline and do not name the leaders. The item presumably refers to the operations led from Üsküb (İshāk Beg's base) against Novobrdo (which was besieged) and Krusevac/Alacahisar (which was taken), see Jorga, *GOR*, i, 395; Jireček, *Geschichte der Serben*, ii, 164.

²⁵ EMP and W₁ (but not OC) name also *Cān Adası* (W₃: *Sığan Adası*), presumably the

Anatoluda Amāsiyyede Yörgeç-oglu Huz̄r Beg varub Canik vilāyetini feth etdi. Sultān 'Alā'eddin ibn-ü Sultān Murād vücüda geldi. Vezirleri İbrāhīm Paşa, Saruca Paşa, Muhammed Ağayıdır. Sene —.

[832/11.10.1428–29.9.1429]

Def'a: Sultān Murād Edrenede karār ediüb, veziri İbrāhīm Paşa vefat ediüb, oğlu Halil Paşa yerine vezir oldı. Mevlānā Veliyeddin kādi²⁶ oldı. Sene —.

[833/30.9.1429–18.9.1430]

Def'a: Sultān Murād vilāyetlere nāmeler gönderiüb, gazā-yı ekberdür dēyiüb, varub, Evrenos-oglı 'Ali Beg, Turhān Beg varub, Seleniki feth etdiler. Ve bu yıl Sultān Şeyh Hācī Bayram vefat etdi.²⁷ Sene —.

[834/19.9.1430–8.9.1431]

Def'a: Sultān Murād sefer etmeyüb, girü²⁸ yaylaya çıktı. İri²⁹ akça kestürdi. Sene —.

[835/9.9.1431–27.8.1432]

Def'a: Sultān Murād sefer etmeyüb, Çökeye³⁰ yaylaya çıktı. Dimetokada Sultān Muhammed vücüda geldi. Vezirleri mezkūr.

'ungarische Insel' of Jireček, II, 160. Incidentally, Jireček's suggestion that this was Neu-Orsova = Adakale receives support from the fact that when the Ottomans re-took Adakale (not yet so named) in 1691 'it was given the name Sāns Adası' (Silihdār, II, 542); no doubt this name refers (as A. Decei points out, in *EI*, second ed., s.v. Ada Kalā) to the 'entrenchments' (German 'Schanz', cf. Redhouse, s.v. *sāns*), but the resemblance between Cān and Sāns suggests that Sāns is also a re-casting, as Turkish army slang, of an older Cān; and this in turn appears to reflect the medieval name 'Saan' (see A. Z. Hertz, *Archivum Ottomanicum*, III, 1971, p. 171, n. 4).

²⁶ i.e. kādi 'asker (as P, which alone of the chronicles mentions this item), in succession to Halil Paşa, who was promoted to the vizierate from that office (OP).

²⁷ Only in P, which also appends the viziers: Halil, Mehemed, Saruca.

²⁸ EOP read Çökeye (C lacks the 'yayla' item), presumably correctly: cf. the letter of Murād II, of 9 June [1431], written na Çoku na planinu (Truhelka, no. 3, cf. *1st. Enst. Dergisi*, I, 1955, 43), cited by Babinger, *Aufsätze*, I (Geburtstag), 169. Babinger could not then (1949) identify the locality; but in his history of Mehemed II (Eroberer, 7 = *Conquérant*, 21 = *Conquistatore*, 33), without giving a reference, describes it as lying north-west of Edirne.

Administratively, Çöke was a nāhiye of the kažā of Edirne, embracing (with other localities which I cannot trace on the map) the villages of Demirhanlı and Ömerobası (Ö. L. Barkan, in *Belgeler*, III, 5–6, 1966, 320, 329, 363), the first of which is shown on modern maps some 15 km. east-north-east and the second 40 km. north-east of Edirne. Other villages of the nāhiye were Karayusuflu and Faki-deresi (M. T. Gökbilgin, *Edirne ve Paşa Livâsı*, İstanbul, 1952, 326, 497), the residents of the last being derbendcis, guarding the road 'from Bogdan and Dobruca'. 'Karajusuf' is marked 18 km. north-east of Edirne on the Austrian General Staff map of 1829. This map also records as 'Faki-dere' the river (now Fakiiska, in Bulgaria) on which is situated 'Umurfakih (Faki)' (now Fakiya), 70 km. north-east of Edirne on the road to Aitos. The yayla of Çöke is therefore to be located north-east of Edirne, somewhere to the west of the yayla of Keşirlik.

²⁹ MS (clearly): *idī*; EOC (*sub anno* 835): *yeñi*; but P: *iri*. The issue of 834 represented a temporary return to the heavier akça of 5½ and even 6½ kīrāt (M. Akdağ, *Türkiye'nin iktisadî ve iştimâli tarîhi*, I, Ankara, 1959, 394, 422–5; cf. OCP, with the note that 260 akças were struck from one *lidre* of silver), so that *iri* is a tenable reading.

³⁰ E: no name; OCP: *Sakar*.

[836/28.8.1432–17.8.1433]

Def'a: *Sultān Murād Edrenede karār édüb, ikindüyile aḥsam arasında gün dutuldu, ‘ālem karañuluk olub, yıldız göründi; girü iki kuyruklu yıldız doğdu, korkulkı; ve Evrenos-oğlu ‘Alī Beg Arnavud < >³¹ vilāyetinde Buzurşek³² üzerinde leşkerümüze şikest vāki‘ oldu, gāzılere bu ḡazā rāst gelmedi.*

[837/18.8.1433–6.8.1434]

Def'a: *Sultān Murād Edrenede karār édüb, beglerbegisi Sinān Beg, Evrenos-oğlu ‘Alī Beg, İshāk Beg, Turhān Beg varub < >³³ étdiler. Ve bu yıl Ungurus kıraklı Koca Kırал gelüb, Gügerçinlige düşüb, almayub, şikest olub gitdi.³⁴ Sene 838.*

[838/7.8.1434–26.7.1435]

Def'a: *Sultān Murād Keşürlik³⁵ yaylasına çikub, Lāz-éline akın vērdi.³⁶ Ve hem bu yıl vebā-yn ekber oldu her vilāyetde. Vezirleri mezkürdur.*

[839/27.7.1435–15.7.1436]

Def'a: *Sultān Murād Edrenede karār édüb, Vilk-oglıyla barışub, veziri Saruca Paşa yonterüb, Vilk kızını nikāh édüb aldı. Vilk-oğlu Semendreyi binā <édüb> tamām étdi.³⁷ Vezirleri mezkür.*

[840/16.7.1436–4.7.1437]

Def'a: *Sultān Murād vilāyet-i Karamāna sefer étdi. Karamān-oğlu İbrāhīm Begle cenc édüb, soñra baruşub, andan gelüb, bu tarafda Boraç³⁸ hisārimi feth étdi. Vezirleri mezkür.*

[841/5.7.1437–23.6.1438]

Def'a: *Sultān Murād Edrenede Yeñi Cāmi‘ binā édüb, kendü eliyle Cum'a gün bināsını urub, Ungurus vilāyetine kaşd édüb, veziri Muhammed Ağayı çıkarub, yérine Hekim Fażlullāh vezir olub, Ungurusa geçdi. Altı pāre kal'alarını feth édüb, vilāyet-i Ungurusda kırk beş gün yürüyüb, soñra gelüb, İflak-élindeñ çıkub,*

³¹ Some words lost by haplography, cf. E: *Arnavud vilāyetine akın eyleyüb rāst gelmeyüb Arnavud vilāyetinde . . .*

³² MS: *bırdıky*, corrected after E (OP: *B.r.zş.k*), and cf. Giese, 113.8. For this name see F. Babinger, *Aufsätze*, I (*Elbasan*), 202.

³³ The missing words refer to the suppression of the Albanian rebellion (discussed by H. İnalek, in *Fatih ve İstanbul*, I, 2, 1953, 164–6).

³⁴ This entry presumably refers to Sigismund's attack in spring 1428 (Jireček, II, 164), i.e. 831 (recorded in OP in an interpolation *sub anno* 828, see above, p. 574, n. 22). ‘Aşikpaşaçāde, it is true, describes (§ 106) an attack in 837 (and is followed by İ. H. Uzunçarşılı, *Osmanlı tarihi*, I, second ed., Ankara, 1961, 414), but his chronology (even his sequence of events) is much distorted for these years; he may well be describing the events of 1428.

³⁵ MS: *k.stürl.k*, corrected after EOMP. The locality Keşirlik is marked on modern maps 55 km. north-east of Edirne.

³⁶ There is no record of this raid in the chronicles, under this or another year.

³⁷ This item is not in E or Giese; the Oruç texts give extra detail.

³⁸ MS: *bür“c*, apparently understood as Bürç in the chronicles. I take the reference to be to Boraç (on the Gruža, south-west of Kragujevac), which was taken, however, according to Jireček (II, 174–5) in 1438 (= 842–3).

*gelüb Edrenede karār etdi. Ve hem bu yıl Ergene köprüsi binası dağı vuruldu.*³⁹ *Sene 181.*

*Beyt: Yeñi Cāmi'-ile Ergene köprüsini
Ungurusa geçdi Sultān-i Murād* Hayr edüben yaptı ol ikisini
*Kodilar tārīh aña 'hummār' ad.*⁴⁰

[842/24.6.1438–13.6.1439]

*Def'a: Sultān Murād Edrenede karār edüb, Sultān 'Alā'eddīni Sultān Muhammedi 'alī düğün eyleyüb sünnet eylesdi. Diğinden sonra varub, Semendreyi feth etdi. Girü bu yıl Evrenos-Beg-oğlu 'Alī Beg vilāyet-i Ungurus'a geçüb, Ungurus tahtı Mehdiye dērler ol şehri vurdu. Ve girü Ungurus leşkerine duş gelüb, gāyet cenc edüb, sonra Hāk ta'ālā furşat vērüb, Ungurus leşkeri<ni> siyub, kirub, baş baş on beş sancak-beglerini dutub, bile sancak-ila getürdi.*⁴¹ *Vezirleri ol yıl Halil Paşa, Saruca Paşa, Hekim Fazlullāh idi. Sene 844.*

[843/14.6.1439–1.6.1440]

*Def'a: Sultān Murād Belgrāda varub, feth olnmayub, andan gelüb Nevābiri kal'asını feth etdi. Hādim Şehābeddin Paşa hem vezir hem beglerbegiyidi, Belgrād öñinde havāleyi yaptı.*⁴² *Vezirleri Halil Paşa, Saruca Paşaydı. Sene 845.*

[844/2.6.1440–21.5.1441]

Def'a: Sultān Murād Edrenede karār edüb, düğün edüb, kızını sultān-zāde<yi> İsfendiyār-oğlu Kaya Bege verdi. Üskübde İshāk bu yıl Hicāza gitdi. Sene 849.

[845/22.5.1441–11.5.1442]

Def'a: Sultān Murād Edrenede karār edüb, Mezid Bege <akın vērüb> Ungurus'a gāzāya gönderdi. Ol gāzā rāst gelmeyüb, Mezid şehīd olub, leşkere şikest vāki' oldı. Sene 846.

[846/12.5.1442–30.4.1443]

Def'a: Sultān Murād Edrenede karār edüb, beglerbegi Şehābeddin Paşayı Ungurus vilāyetine gönderüb üç biñ Yeñi-çeriyile, sancak-beglerinden Fīrūz Beg, Ya'kūb Beg, Veled-i Fenārī Umur Beg,⁴³ bunuñ bigi nice sancak-begleri, tamām on altı sancak-begleriyle. Girü leşkerimüze şikest vāki' olub, sancak-begleri cümle şehīd oldılar. Ol gāzā girü rāst gelmeyüb, bākī kalan leşkerler gelüb gitdiler. Sene 847.

³⁹ Not recorded in E, Giese, or P. OCM (and M₂) mention it earlier in the annal, together with the 'New' (i.e. Üç Şerefeli) Mosque.

⁴⁰ MS: *toslalar tārīh anlara hummār ad.* P has only the second couplet: *Ungurusa geçdiyi Sultān Murād / komşular tārīhin anuñ hummār ad.* M margin has simply: *tārīh hummār 841.*

⁴¹ All texts have the Semendre item, and under 842: the campaign, beginning in March 1439 with Semendre falling in August, covered the two years 842–3. OCP record 'Alī Beg's expedition (not mentioned in E or Giese), but in different words, *sub anno* 843, immediately after the Belgrade item—and perhaps correctly, if it was intended as a diversion during the siege of Belgrade (cf. Jireček, II, 176), i.e. in summer 1440.

⁴² The 'havāle' point appears in OP (only) after the mention of Şehābeddin Paşa *sub anno* 846.

⁴³ ECM give no names, O has two, and P (adding Hızır Bahı) has four.

[847/1.5.1443–19.4.1444]

Def'a: *Sultān Murād Hān Karamāna* sefer etdi, oğlu *Sultān 'Alā'eddīn Amāsiyye* leşkeri bile. Soñra *Ibrāhīm Begle* gerü şuh olunub, gelüb gidüb *Edrenede* karar etmiş iken, ol hīnde *Sultān 'Alā'eddīnün* vefatı haberi gelüb, *Sultān Murād* bu mātem içindeyiken || *Dest-pot Ungurusdan Yanko mel'ün* getürüb *İzladi* derbendinde cenc edüb, bākī kışşa ma'lūmdur. Sene 848.

[848/20.4.1444–8.4.1445]

Def'a: *Sultān Murād Hān* begligini terk edüb, oğlu *Sultān Muhammed* ismarlayub *Anaçoluda* karar etmiş iken, *Unguruz kiral* ve beglerbegisi *Yanko mel'ün Varnaya* gelüb, *Sultān Murād Saruhan* *Anaçoludan* gelüb, leşkerler cem' edüb, — bu yıl *Üsküb Begi İshāk Beg* vefat edüb — oğlu *İsā Beg* ve 'Ömer Beg veled*ü* *Turhān Beg* — ol vakıt *Turhān Beg* Tokatda habs idi — *Hızır Beg* veled*ü* *Mihāl Beg*, bu begler cem' olub, *Varnada 'azīm cenc olub, soñra fursat gāzülerün olub, kāfīre şikest vāki'* olub, *kıraluñ* başı kesildi.

Varna jazāsin dēr-iseñ şāh-i mā Dēdiler tārīh aña 'zevāk-i mā'.⁴⁴

[849/9.4.1445–28.3.1446]

Def'a: *Sultān Murād Hān* begligini terk edüb, oğlu *Sultān Mehemed* ismarlayub, varub *Anaçoluda* yerde⁴⁵ karar edüb, şehr-i *Edrene* tamām yanub hark olub, ol vakıt vezirleri *Halil Paşa*, *Kāsim Paşa*, Rūm-eli beglerbegisi *Ṭayı Karaca*, *Anaçolu* beg *Uzgür-oğlu İsā Beg*. Sene 855.

[850/29.3.1446–18.3.1447]

Def'a: *Sultān Murād Hān* *Anaçoluda* *Ma'nisada* karar edüb, bunda *Edrenede* *Yeñi-çeri* baş *kaldurub*, *Bucuk Depeye* çikub, 'ālem kariş murş olub, 'ākibet begler ittifāk-ila *Sultān Murād Hān* *Anaçoludan* getürüb, *giriü* tahta geçiüb, *Sultān Mehemedi* *Anaçoluya* gönderüb, ol kış *Moraya* sefer edüb, varub *Germeyi* feth edüb, bu yıl 'Acem pādişāhi Şāh-i Ruh vefat edüb,⁴⁶ vezirleri *Halil Paşa*, *Saruca Paşa*, *Kāsim Paşa*, *Şehābeddin Paşayı*. Sene 851.

[851/19.3.1447–6.3.1448]

Def'a: *Sultān Murād* *Edrenede* karar edüb, *Sultān Bāyezīd ibn-ü Sultān* *<Mehemmed>* dojdi.

[852/7.3.1448–23.2.1449]

Kos-ovanuñ tārīhin bilmek dilerseñ sen hemān
Bu jazānuñ tārīhi 'hallāk-i subhān'.⁴⁷

Def'a: *Sultān Murād* *Arnavuda* sefer etdi, *Kocacık* hīşarını feth etdi. || *Giriü* ol hīnde *giriü* *Yanko mel'ün* *Ungurus* vilāyetine kıral olub, leşkerler cem' edüb,

⁴⁴ MS: *dēmişler anuñ tārīhin zevāk-i mā*, emended after P (47v.16), which alone of the chronicles gives this couplet.

⁴⁵ Sic; chronicles: *Mağnisāya*. A few words have perhaps been lost.

⁴⁶ This obit appears only in P.

⁴⁷ P gives (52r.4), with no couplet, the chronogram *ḥālik-i subhān* (either phrase gives the correct total, 852).

〈*Kos*〉ovaya geldi. *Sulṭān Murād* dahi *Kos*-ovaya çıktı. Cenk olnub, soñra kāfirlere şikest vāki‘ oldu. *Kos*-ova cengi Ṣa‘bān ayınını 24 Cum‘a gün.⁴⁸

Sulṭān Murād Edrenede karār edüb, beglerbegisi Karaca Beg Rūm-eli leşkeri ile varub, Yergök hissārını yapub meremmet etdiler.

*Ve hem düğün edüb, Dū 'l-Kādir-oğlu kızını *Sulṭān Mehemed* alverdi.* Begler, vezirler yेरlü yérinde. *Tamām.*

A close general resemblance to the Anonymous Chronicles in the recension of MS W₃ and MS E and a still closer resemblance to the Oruç texts is apparent from the beginning of the annal which I have dated 826 up to the word *içindehyiken* in the annal for 847. But whereas before this block of common text these Annals have merely two laconic entries for 824 and 825, the chronicles here share a detailed account of the operations against Murād II's uncle 'Düzme' Muṣṭafā; and after the *içindehyiken* they have a much fuller text describing the two great campaigns of the İzladi Pass (1443) and Varna (1444). The Annals and the chronicles then run parallel for the years 849, 850, and 851, to diverge again after the first sentence of the entry for 852, where the chronicles present a long account of the battle of Kosova (1448). They come together again for the final items, with indisputable verbal correspondences, but also with patent discrepancies, to whose possible significance we shall return.

First we consider the fundamental question: have these Annals been excerpted by a copyist from one of the chronicles, or do they represent—admittedly in a debased form—the source adopted by an early compiler of the chronicles to serve as the framework for his account of these years?

Recent 'form-criticism' of the chronicles has indicated (1) that the common matter shared by about the first half of 'Aşikpaşaşađe's history with the Anonymous-Oruç group derives principally from an anonymous⁴⁹ chronicle-text, not extant in its original form, which apparently ended with the account of Düzme Muṣṭafā's capture and execution (in 825/1422, something over a year after Murād's accession in June 1421);⁵⁰ (2) that the succeeding matter in the chronicles represents one or more chronological lists (*takvīm*); (3) that the chronicles are, here and there, filled out by interpolated *gazānāmes*—discursive popular accounts of the most noteworthy campaigns.⁵¹

The 'Annals' in the Digby MS present, I contend, a text of almost exactly the character⁵² and of broadly the content which these assumptions lead us to predicate for the first chronological list to be appended to the basic chronicle text. My hypothesis is that an early compiler, having recorded from the basic

⁴⁸ At this point the chronicles give the date 852 and begin a new annal; see below, p. 580.

⁴⁹ Not 'the *menākib* of Yaḥṣı Fakih', see *BSOAS*, xxvi, 1, 1963, 52.

⁵⁰ When I give no specific reference for a date I am following the chronology in Halil İnalçık's invaluable critical collation of the Ottoman and the Western sources in his article 'Murad II' in *İslām ansiklopedisi*.

⁵¹ H. İnalçık, in Lewis and Holt (ed.), *Historians of the Middle East*, 159.

⁵² The exception is the system of dating, for the discussion of which see below, p. 583.

text the death of Düzme Muṣṭafā, reproduced the Annals for 826–46 in full, and then, towards the end of the Annal for 847, interpolated a *gazānāme* for the İzladi campaign (the precise point of interpolation may now be identified in the chronicles by the characteristic phrase of transition . . . *içindeyiken / Gerü bu tarafdan . . .*);⁵³ he continued to use the same, or another, *gazānāme* for Varna (848), and then returned to the Annals for 849–51, when there were no major campaigns. Having (probably) adopted the Annals' first item for 852, he switched, with a similar phrase of transition,⁵⁴ to a *gazānāme* for Kosova.

The converse interpretation, that the Annals are merely passages excerpted from a chronicle-text, is hardly tenable: it implies that the excerpter had available a chronicle containing various details not found in any known manuscript⁵⁵ and also that he dropped not only the '*gazānāme*' matter (which admittedly he might have found too discursive for his purpose) but also the long passage on Düzme Muṣṭafā which figures in all the chronicle-texts⁵⁶—and which, reproduced as it is by 'Āşıkpaşaزادe',⁵⁷ must be presumed to have stood not in an appended *takvīm* or *gazānāme* but in the early redaction of the chronicle which 'Āpz. used. The bare entries for 824 and 825 in the Digby MS represent, I suggest, the original text of the *takvīm*, which the compiler left aside, preferring the longer account offered by his chronicle-source.⁵⁸

Still granting only the presumption that the Annals represent the original text, we turn to the final entries to see whether, as the hypothesis requires, the chronicles show at this point any signs of editing by a compiler. Digby's Annalist runs together in his final, undated, paragraph the capture of Kocacık/Svetigrad, the battle of Kosova, Murād's residing at Edirne, the re-fortifying of Giurgiu, and the marriage of Prince Mehemed. The dates of the first two events are clearly established—July and October 1448, both falling in A.H. 852, and this is evidently the year to which this first part of the paragraph relates. The marriage, however, certainly took place later. The late Professor Babinger argued for spring 853/1449, being strongly influenced by the sequence presented in Oruç,⁵⁹ namely:

⁵³ E 34v.11 = Giese 67.3; O 53.24 = C 117.18 = M 45v.15 = P 43v.8.

⁵⁴ *-iken / bu egnāda*: E 38v.4 = Giese 70.26; O 59.24 = C 121.20 = P 49r.3.

⁵⁵ Some of these items are considered below, p. 582.

⁵⁶ E 31v.3–32v.3 = Giese 56.2–59.16; O 46.6–47.15 = C 112.11–113.15 = M 41v.4–42v.12 = P 37r.4–38r.6.

⁵⁷ §§ 83–7.

⁵⁸ It is interesting that the Annalist regards Muṣṭafā as Murād's 'brother' (in fact he was his uncle) and yet calls him 'Düzme', 'Impostor'. The 'brothers' of the annal for 824 must be the two Muṣṭafās, for the haggling with the Byzantine Emperor over the two younger brothers, Yūsuf and Maḥmūd, hardly ranks as 'warfare' (*cenk*). This tradition of the 'two brothers' seems to have figured also in the chronicle-source: see 'Āpz., heading to § 82 (*ve karındaşları daḥı ne oldu*, Yūsuf and Maḥmūd not being mentioned until § 94), and cf. Giese 55.29: *Sultan Mehemediň oğlanları her tarafdan baş kaldurdılar* (so too E, whereas the phrase is lacking—edited out?—in Oruç). 'Rūhi', incidentally, also refers to Murād as Düzme Muṣṭafā's 'brother' (MS Marsh 313, fol. 106v, but omitted in the Algiers and Berlin MSS).

⁵⁹ O 64.4–16 (and now P 52r.5–19). C does not mention the marriage.

853: Murād at Edirne; Giurgiu; the marriage; Murād went to a *yayla*;

854: unsuccessful siege of Akçehişär;

855: death of Murād, Wednesday 1 Muharrem.

Babinger contended, in effect, that Western sources, dating the long siege of Akçehişär (Kruja) to April-(?)September 1450, confirm Oruç's date of 854; that Oruç explicitly places the marriage in the preceding year; and that if Murād went after the marriage to a *yayla*, a *summer*-residence, the marriage must have taken place in spring 853/1449.⁶⁰ İnalcık, however, has convincingly rejected this dating⁶¹ in favour of late 854 (beg. 14.2.1450), on the ground of the almost exact agreement of two completely independent sources: Ducas's dating to the September-December before Murād's death (i.e. 1450) and Enveri's to Şevvâl-Zu'l-Kâ'de 854 (November-December 1450). Murād died in the first days of February 1451, a matter of weeks afterwards, so that for an 'annalist' the marriage must have been the last 'event' of his reign.⁶² The Digby Annalist, it seems clear, having preserved his dated series of entries up to the Kosova item (852), simply tacked on, without a 'def'a', the undated items 'Giurgiu' (probably 853)⁶³ and 'marriage' (certainly 854).

But what has happened in the chronicles? Oruç's sequence is patently wrong, and this is rather surprising, since Oruç seems, by and large, to be more reliable than the other chronicle-texts. A plausible explanation for the confusion is that we are here indeed at a point in the chronicles where two sources have been inexpertly stitched together: if a compiler, having before him the Digby text with its items 'Murād at Edirne'—'Giurgiu'—'marriage' and finding in his next source the items '*yayla*'—'Akçehişär'—'death', failed to notice that they needed to be interwoven (to give the closing sequence 'Akçehişär'—'marriage'—'death') and simply appended them in a block, the result would be the (demonstrably incorrect) sequence of Oruç.⁶⁴

So far the case still, perhaps, falls short of proof, but an argument or two can be added. If these Annals represent the source, we should expect them to present here and there details which can be proved from external evidence to be closer to historical reality than the presumably worked-over (and hence presumably deteriorated) chronicles. This indeed seems to be the fact: the Annals record a new issue of coinage in 834, a date confirmed by the coin-

⁶⁰ *Aufsätze*, I (*Heirat*), 229–32.

⁶¹ *Fatih devri üzerinde tatkikler ve vesikalar*, I, Ankara, 1954, 108–9.

⁶² cf. also 'Āpz.'s moralizing comments in § 121, that with his son married Murād had achieved all his earthly goals.

⁶³ For the historical context (the installation of a pro-Ottoman voyvode in Wallachia) see H. İnalcık, *Fatih devri*, p. 98, n. 130.

⁶⁴ The redactor of W₁ (who revised and expanded the text, not always successfully) gives the apparently impeccable sequence:

853: Giurgiu; raid into Wallachia and appointment of new voyvode;

854: siege of Akçehişär; marriage 'that winter' ;

855: death of Murād, Wednesday 1 Muharrem.

It seems that he had access to a good source (Enveri?), which gave him the 'Wallachia' item and the correct sequence.

catalogues, whereas the chronicles put this item in 835; they record the birth of Mehemed II in 835, against the chronicles' 834;⁶⁵ and they record Murād II's first abdication (in August 1444) as the first 'event' of 848 (beg. 20.4.1444), whereas the chronicles, appending it to the events of 847, put it too early.

Again, if the Digby Annals represent the source, we may expect them to preserve two or three details which the compiler of the chronicle-text dropped, either by accident or because they seemed to him no longer of importance. Such might be: (1) the names of the begs leading the operations of 830; (2) the birth of Prince 'Alā'eddin (ascribed to 831);⁶⁶ (3) the attribution of the capture of Salonica (833) to the *uc-begis* rather than to the sultan himself;⁶⁷ (4) the Hungarian attack on Golubac;⁶⁸ (5) the pilgrimage made by İshāk Beg of Üsküb (ascribed to 844)⁶⁹ and his death (apparently in 848).⁷⁰

Conversely, it is true, the chronicles record various items which this text of the Annals seems to have dropped: the final campaign against Cüneyd in 829,⁷¹ the Ottoman occupation of 'Cān Adası' in 831, the names of the towns in Karaman taken in 840, etc. The Annals have therefore survived in this manuscript only in a truncated and corrupt version; and even where the text appears to be beyond suspicion its data can occasionally be proved to be inaccurate: thus the fall of Borač (1438) occurred in A.H. 841 or 842, not in 840; the fall of Semendre (August 1439) occurred in 843, not in 842; the fall of Novobrdo (June 1441)⁷² occurred in 845, not in 843.⁷³

The principal point of general interest is that the Annals so frequently mention the names of the viziers. This characteristic has hitherto been regarded as peculiar to the *Oruç* texts; but it now seems clear that it was the original *takvīm*-source that not only recorded the names when there was a change in the membership of the *Divān* but also, for the other years, either repeated the names (as in the Annals for 827, 828) or noted, in the words *vezirleri mezkür*

⁶⁵ The strong evidence in favour of 835 is summed up by İnalçık in *Fatih devri*, p. 55, n. 2.

⁶⁶ Enveri, the only other Ottoman source to give a date, has 830; cf. *Fatih devri*, p. 55 and n. 4.

⁶⁷ cf. also the tone of 'Apz.'s § 105.

⁶⁸ See above, p. 576, n. 34.

⁶⁹ 'Apz. accompanied İshāk Beg on this pilgrimage (§ 113), but his chronology is in confusion. However, since he states that they returned 'before Semendre fell' (August 1439), the pilgrimage they made was presumably that of 841 (Dhū 'l-Hijja 841 = June 1438).

⁷⁰ He is called 'merhüm' in a *vakıfîye* of 848 (İnalçık, *Fatih devri*, p. 83, n. 67).

⁷¹ See above, p. 574, n. 21.

⁷² So Jireček, II, 178. İnalçık ('Murad II', col. 607a), following the chronicles, prefers 1440.

⁷³ A discrepancy of one year in the middle years of Murād's reign is not surprising, for the 31 Hijri years cover only 30 solar—and thus 'campaigning'—years and in the decade 835–45 Muhamrem moved back from September to May; hence even a careful annalist could easily misdate by one a summer's event falling this side or the other of the Muslim new year. A clear example is the eclipse and the comet both recorded *sub anno* 836: the eclipse occurred on 17.6.1433 (Oppolzer, no. 6284, see Babinger, in *MOG*, II, 3–4, 1926, 313), which indeed falls in 836, but the comet (September 1433, see V. Grumel, *Traité d'études byzantines*. I. *La chronologie*, Paris, 1958, 475), though it appeared at the end of the same summer, in fact belongs to 837.

or the like, 'no change' (as in the Annals for 829, 830, 835, 838, 839, 840). Such a phrase has survived only twice in the *Oruç* texts: ⁷⁴ evidently *Oruç* or his copyists dropped nearly all the 'no change' notes, whilst the compiler(s) of the 'Anonymous Chronicles', both in the Giese redactions and in the redaction of MS E, omitted all references to the viziers.⁷⁵

The arrangement in these Annals suggests further that the 'viziers' note came consistently at the end of the year's entry but before the date. In *Oruç*, however, a viziers-entry sometimes appears after the date (but before the *Girü* . . . introducing the next annal); and comparison with this text suggests that such an entry may not (as it appears to) belong to the immediately preceding date but to the following annal. Under 841, for example, this text records (and, exceptionally, in the middle of the annal) the replacement of Mehemed Ağa by Fażlullāh; yet in OCM this note appears immediately after the date 840 ⁷⁶ and in P it is dislodged onto the margin against the 840 entry.

Given that the Digby text is patently poor, and given also that some of the discrepancies between it and the *Oruç* texts may arise not from corruption but from conscious revision by *Oruç*, it is profitless at this stage to analyse the entries too closely, but this much may be said: that in exploiting the valuable data in *Oruç* one should bear in mind the possibility that an item has 'drifted' from the correct to an adjacent year; and that *Oruç*'s vizier-entries are now seen to be not his personal contribution to the textual tradition of the 'Anonymous Chronicles' but a feature which he preserved from the *takvīm*-source, just as his ostensibly characteristic *dibāce* was preserved (as MS E demonstrates) from the original chronicle-source.⁷⁷

There remains one objection to our accepting the Digby text as reproducing the *takvīm*-source of the chronicles: its method of dating. Each annal in the 'royal' *takvīm*-lists is dated not by *Hijrī* years but by the number of years elapsed since the compilation of the Palace almanac in which the list appears; and although the chronicles nowhere have a 'years elapsed' numeral, Giese (but not *Oruç*) occasionally presents instead of the expected finite verb the grammatical construction—*-eldenberü*, 'since [the event] occurred'—which the 'years elapsed' dating system demands. In the early redaction E, these constructions are numerous, appearing first in the annals for 791 and 800; ⁷⁸

⁷⁴ M 44r.1 (*vezirler mezkūrlar*, apparently referring to 837); O 51.19 (*vezirleri kemā-kān*, immediately after the date 841).

⁷⁵ The naming of the three viziers at Giese 55.24–5 (*sub anno* 824) is part of the 'narrative' and stood in the chronicle-source (cf. 'Apz., § 81). (The Annals text, naming only two for 824, is not necessarily defective, since Bāyezid Pasa had probably been killed by the end of the year.)

⁷⁶ Hence İnalçık, following O, has dated Fażlullāh's appointment to 840 ('Murad II', 605b); but the Annals' date and wording (*kaşd édüb*) fortify his point (*Fatih devri*, 1) of the connexion between Fażlullāh's entry into the *Divān* and the adoption of an aggressive policy in Europe.

⁷⁷ See *BSOAS*, xxx, 2, 1967, 321–2.

⁷⁸ These, and some other early items, are evidently interpolations in the basic chronicle-source.

then in a cluster for 829–31, 833–47, 849–50 (reign of Murād II); and sporadically for 11 years between 866 and 893. The chronicles' *takvīm*-source(s), it would appear, were constructed, like the 'royal' lists, on a years-elapsed system of dating, which the compiler(s) of the chronicles re-computed—and remarkably successfully—into Hijrī years, only Oruç making a clean sweep by eliminating every redundant *-eldenberii*.

That the Digby text bears no such trace of a 'years elapsed' dating is at first sight an argument against its priority to the chronicle-texts. But the argument weakens when the apparent confusion in its Hijrī dates is analysed. After the correct date within the annal for 824, there is no *sene* entry at all for the presumptive years 825–8, 835–6, 838–40, 848, 851–3, and only *sene* with a blank for 830–4. '829' is correct; '181' (in spite of the chronogram) for 841 is an index of the copyist's stupidity; and '849' for 844 and '855' for 849 are little better. But two entries show a two-year and five a one-year discrepancy;⁷⁹ and these errors, not to be explained by a copyist's confusion of figures or of words, are precisely those which would probably, indeed inevitably, arise from a 'years elapsed' system of computation. Thus the Digby text's inaccurate presentation of Hijrī dates is an argument not against but for its priority: we are confronted by the efforts of a not over-intelligent copyist who was attempting to re-compute the dating from a years-elapsed system into Hijrī years—and who was, for the most part, giving up the struggle.

As to the Annalist himself, although at first sight the words *bunda Edrenede* in his entry for 850 suggest that he was resident in Adrianople, the *bunda* read in the context may mean only 'in Rūmeli' (as opposed to the immediately preceding 'in Anadolu'); to judge from his interest in the *uc-begīs*, and more particularly İshāk Beg, and from his recording the capture of the little fortress of Borač, his interests appear to have lain more specifically in Macedonia. His text seems to be a crucial piece to be fitted into the jigsaw puzzle of the Anonymous Chronicles; it is a pity that the copyist did not transmit it with its edges more clear-cut.

⁷⁹ Respectively '844–5' for 842–3; '838', '846–8', '851' for 837, 845–7, 850.